DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 445 028 TM 031 633

AUTHOR San Miguel, Trinidad; Garza, Ruben; Gibbs, Warren
TITLE Pre-Kindergarten-16 Educational Accountability System: The Lone Star State's Response and Is Anyone Listening?
PUB DATE 2000-04-27
NOTE 41p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Achievement; *Accountability; Elementary Secondary Education; Evaluation Methods; Preschool Education; Public Schools; *State Programs; Student Evaluation; Teacher Certification; *Teacher Education; *Testing Programs
IDENTIFIERS *Texas

ABSTRACT

This report describes the accountability system for the Texas public schools and notes recognition the system has received. Since 1993, the state has had an accountability system for prekindergarten-12 schools. The addition in 1998 of an accountability system for educator preparation makes Texas the first state to create a prekindergarten-grade 16 educational accountability system aimed at improving the performance of public school systems. Findings related to the base indicators for the public school system show improvement for many student demographic groups. Texas is 1 of only 12 states recognized by the National Education Goals Panel for making progress toward the 8 national education goals, and it was 1 of 6 states to show improvement on National Assessment of Educational Progress mathematics scores between 1992 and 1996. The accountability system for educator preparation ensures that teacher candidates complete accredited programs and pass Texas certification tests. Texas was one of only two states to receive an "A" for educational improvement from the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation. Although an achievement gap still exists between students of color and white students, Texas is taking steps to reduce this disparity. Six appendixes contain portions of the Texas Administrative Code, a list of accredited teacher preparation programs, and supplemental information about educator certification. (Contains 1 table and 39 references.) (SLD)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 445 028

Pre-Kindergarten-16 Educational Accountability System: The Lone Star State's Response and Is Anyone Listening?

Authors
Trinidad San Miguel, Ed. D
Southwest Texas State University

Rubén Garza
Education Service Center, Region XIII

Warren Gibbs
Education Service Center, Region XIII

Discussant
Arthur Hernández, Ph. D.
University of Texas – San Antonio

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

T.S. Miguel

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Presented at the Annual Conference of the American Educational Research Association

New Orleans, Louisiana

April 27, 2000

TM031633

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Pre-Kindergarten-16 Educational Accountability System: The Lone Star State's Response and Is Anyone Listening?

Introduction

The Accountability System for Texas public schools has been in place since 1993. Accreditation ratings for both the campuses (Pre-Kindergarten-12) and districts are annually released to the public in August and are based on their ability to meet the standards for three base indicators to be discussed later. There are different reactions by stakeholders depending on the accreditation rating. Since September 1998, educator preparation programs in institutions of higher education or alternative certification programs in Texas are also held accountable for the performance of their candidates on state examinations. The Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET) is required to become a certified educator. The accountability system for educator preparation programs is called the Accountability System for Educator Preparation (ASEP) and accreditation ratings are released annually in September. Details regarding the accreditation ratings and standards will be presented in later sections. With the establishment and continuing development of these two accountability systems, Texas is the first state in the nation to create a Pre-Kindergarten-16 (PK-16) educational accountability system intended to improve performance of public school students.

Why Accountability?

As workers are increasingly expected to weather multiple career changes, it is imperative for schools to emphasize the importance of lifelong learning, strengthen the students' thinking and problem-solving skills, and increase their adaptability (Thompson, 1994, page 2). One might speculate that the need for a more educated work force,

possessing a better foundation of knowledge and skills, and the demands of a high tech industry facing those individuals can result in an economic gap between the well-educated and poorly educated. How does a society respond to developing a more highly skilled and intellectually trained labor pool? One way is to hold institutions accountable by prescribing the " 'correct' " way to manage an organization to achieve its goals (Johns, 1996, page 11). The prevailing dogma is that desired reforms can be installed through exhortation or, if necessary, prescription, regardless of the character of particular schools and their professional traditions (Holt, 1996, page 241).

Educational assessment is not a new idea for educators. What is different is the involvement of accrediting agencies, legislatures, and the national government in mandating standards, curriculum, and assessment instruments (Sewall, 1997). In the past decade, education became a focus of national attention because minorities were underachieving, assessment instruments were not equitable, evaluation instruments were biased, and the school systems were not producing an educated labor force. The general public, the business community, and the policy makers demanded more from our educational institutions in terms of performance. Elliot (1997) reports that in 1987 the National Governors' Association issued a report placing more emphasis on performance goals, accountability and public monitoring. The 1990s was the decade of accountability because of the imposition of standards and the emphasis on assessment (Sewall, 1997). Sewall (1997) adds the focus on assessment may force K-12 and higher educators to reexamine practices more than in the history of American education. As we prepare for the new millennium, it is evident that our future depends on a diversified and well-educated society. The best measure of a successful education system, therefore, would be

assessments that evaluate students' achievement on the basis of their performance and what they produce (The Editors, 1997).

Recently, the quality of academic preparation has been criticized nationally by the media. Many in higher education agree and believe that a connection between institutions of higher education and public schools needs to be addressed. According to Jennings (1989) much of the criticism hails from groups affiliated with institutions of higher education. Furthermore, John Goodlad in *Teachers for our Nation's Schools* (1990) has led the call for " 'simultaneous renewal' " in K-12 education and in universities and colleges, particularly in those purporting to prepare educators.

This investigation expands existing knowledge of low educational achievement among students of color both at the public school level and higher education. Furthermore, the academic underachievement of the African American and Hispanic demographic groups in comparison to the white demographic group on TAAS dictates further study in a most crucial time when there is a high drop out rate among students of color. In addition, the academic underachievement of the African American and Hispanic demographic groups in comparison to the white demographic group on the ExCET and the Texas Oral Proficiency Test (TOPT) also necessitates a closer investigation. The teacher shortage in Texas, especially educators of color, makes it a critical issue in educator preparation. The disparate impact of ExCET and TOPT on candidates of color has generated discussions not only in the educator preparation communities, but, in addition, among those it impacts the most, namely people of color. Rebell (1987) concurs that thousands of black and Hispanic students who have prepared for teaching careers are being denied entrance certification to a profession in which

minorities are already underrepresented. Furthermore, institutions of higher education have a moral and ethical obligation to mold a workforce equipped with the knowledge and skills to perform not just adequately, but competitively. Trueba and Bartolome (1997) believe in focusing on the strengths of Latino students and other people of color because our future depends on their successes and academic achievement. It is an important variable to consider since people of color will comprise the majority in public schools and "by the year 2000 the population of the United States will be 43% people of color" (Wittmer, 1992, page 1). Locke (1992) concurs that by the year 2075 an expanded portion of the total United States' population will be comprised of African Americans, Alaskan Natives, American Natives, Hispanic Americans, and Asian Americans.

Standardized Assessments and Accountability

Sewall (1997) indicates that standardized tests are driving forces in educational assessment which determine the status of a student or an educational program. Accountability alone is not a panacea for solving today's complex problems, but it does imply more rigorous learning outcomes will be expected and the diagnostic instrument will therefore put all students on an equal plateau. This will be true only to the extent that teachers who serve these students are able to teach in ways demanded by assessments - that is, in ways supporting the development of higher order thinking and performance skills and in ways diagnosing and building upon individual learners' strengths and needs (Darling-Hammond, 1994).

There is no doubt that one of the most serious problems in American education is the consistently low achievement of African American and Hispanic students. Ravitch, (1996) agrees there has been some narrowing of test score differences between different

racial groups during the past twenty years, but average differences remain large. Likewise, the use of standardized tests for teacher testing continues to be a controversial issue, especially regarding the disparate impact of examinations on prospective teachers of color, as well as on the certifying entity. Professor Walter A. Mercer (1983) of Florida Agricultural and Mechanical University, a historically black college supported by the state, predicts that " 'future teachers from minority groups could become vanishing breeds' " (p.29). It is true that more career opportunities have opened up for people of color outside the education realm but, as Rebell (1987) continues, the impact of the disparate pass rates cannot be ignored.

Low minority pass rates do not reflect a lack of aptitude in the candidates but, as Rebell (1987) points out, are the result of a substantial underlying deficiency in candidates' academic preparation. Consequently, the central focus is that of providing quality educational opportunities and training for all prospective educators. If teacher candidates are not adequately prepared for teacher certification tests, the deficiencies in examinee preparation, as Downs and Silvestro (1988) claim, may serve to accentuate test performance differences between examinees. In addition, if teacher education programs cannot ensure that their graduates are of high quality, the temptation to produce teachers through quick and superficial alternative means will be heightened, especially in areas of shortages (Robinson, 1996).

The Texas Public School Accountability System

The rise of accountability in the State of Texas has been credited to three reasons. First, in 1989, Senate Bill 417 mandated that the State Board of Education adopt specific performance indicators for comparing a district's performance to a projection of the

district's expected performance. This mandate was to become the primary basis for the current accountability system and the major decision-making factor for determining the accreditation status of a school district (Texas Education Agency, 1994).

Second, the passage of Senate Bill 1 in June 1990 mandated the creation of district and campus site-based decision making (SBDM) committees to function in an advisory capacity to local school boards and principals, respectively. This piece of legislation held the campus principal accountable for progress made, but it also provided that campus principal with the authority needed to start the school improvement process with more control in areas that impact student performance (Texas Education Agency, 1994).

Third, House Bill 2885 passed in May 1991 required "site-based decision making." This legislation is an extension of the move toward decentralization begun with the passage of Senate Bill 1. Caldwell and Spinks (1988) and Texas Education Agency (TEA, 1992) assert that the desired improvement is sought through a collaborative effort by which stakeholders assess educational outcomes of all students, determine goals and strategies, and ensure that strategies are implemented and adjusted to improve student achievement. Site-based management also makes school staff members accountable as professionals (Caldwell and Spinks, 1988). In Texas, SBDM committees are limited by the parameters stated in both the district's SBDM plan and its policy (Texas Education Agency, 1992). Categories within which the committee can offer advice include goal setting, budgeting, school organization, personnel, curriculum, and staff development. Basically, it is a combination of centralization and decentralization where some aspects

of each category are still the district's domain; and some aspects are assigned to the campuses.

Implementation of the Texas Accountability System

The Texas Accountability System evaluates the performance of public school districts and their respective campuses (Texas Education Agency, 1994). This system integrates district accreditation status; campus ratings; district and campus recognition for high performance and performance improvement; and campus-, district-, and state-level reports. Detailed information regarding how the accountability system is implemented is found in the TEA manual, 1999 Accountability Manual: The 1999 Accountability Rating System for Texas Public Schools and School Districts and Blueprint for the 2000 –2003 Accountability Systems located at http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/99/manual/body.html. The TEA website address is http://www.tea.state.tx.us.

The Academic Excellence Indicator System (AEIS) is the basis for determining all accountability ratings, rewards, and reports. For 1999, district ratings include Exemplary, Recognized, Academically Acceptable, Academically Unacceptable, Unacceptable: Special Accreditation Investigation (SAI), and Charter. Campus ratings include Exemplary, Recognized, Acceptable, Low-performing, Not Rated, and Alternative Education: Acceptable, Needs Peer Review, and Not Rated (Texas Education Agency, 1999).

Accountability ratings are determined annually by meeting the standards for three base indicators: Texas Assessment of Academic Skills (TAAS) performance in reading, mathematics, and writing; Dropout Rate; and Attendance Rate. See Table 1:

Accountability Ratings Standards for 1999 for more information (Texas Education Agency, 1999).

For 1999, 121 districts and 1,110 campuses received the Exemplary rating; 381 districts and 1,842 campuses received the Recognized rating; 526 districts received Academically Acceptable and 3,150 campuses received the Acceptable rating; while nine districts received the Academically Unacceptable rating and 102 campuses received the Low-performing rating. Eighty-four percent of the students who took the TAAS test were included in the accountability system, up from 76 percent last year. This increase is due to the inclusion of special education students and Spanish TAAS-takers in the system. In addition, the TAAS passing standards for the district and campus acceptable rating increased from 40 percent last year to 45 percent this year (Association of Texas Professional Educators, 2000).

Statute provides monetary rewards for high performing or improving schools. The Texas Successful School Award System (TSSAS) provides for campus monetary awards to schools. The Texas Legislature appropriated $5 million to fund this program and the 1998 awards are directed at those schools rated Exemplary, Recognized, or Acceptable which have exhibited significant gains in student performance. The highest performing districts and campuses are also exempted by statute from specific regulations and requirements.

District and campus AEIS reports show performance on all performance (base and additional) indicators as well as profile data items. Profile items are student, staff, and budgeted financial information which provide context for interpreting the performance results. A second reporting component required by statute is the School

Report Card. TEA provides each district with custom School Report Cards which the school, in turn, must provide to each student's family (Texas Education Agency, 1999).

Results for Base Indicators

The results of the three base indicators for the Texas Public School Accountability again show improvement for many of the student demographic groups. The following discussion focuses on statewide TAAS results (summed across grades) in reading, mathematics, and writing and comparing the passing rates of 1997-98 to 1998-99, as well as the dropout rate and attendance rate. This information is provided in Table 1, as well as passing rates since 1993 (Texas Education Agency, 1999).

In reading, African American students and Hispanic students' passing rates remained constant at 78.2 percent and 79.5 percent respectively. Slight decreases were reported for all students from 87.0 percent to 86.5 percent, white students from 94.7 percent to 93.7 percent, and Economically Disadvantaged students from 78.4 percent to 78.2 percent.

All of the passing rates in mathematics for all student demographic groups reflect an increase. All students from 84.2 percent to 85.7 percent, African American students from 70.5 percent to 72.8 percent, Hispanic students from 77.7 percent to 80.7 percent, white students from 91.9 percent to 92.5 percent, and Economically Disadvantaged students from 76.1 percent to 78.7 percent.

In writing, the passing rates reflect an increase for all demographic groups, however, white students showed a slight decrease from 93.4 percent to 93.1 percent. Passing rates for all students increased from 87.4 percent to 88.2 percent, African American students from 80.4 percent to 81.9 percent, Hispanic students from 80.9

percent to 83.1 percent, and Economically Disadvantaged students from 79.7 percent to 81.4 percent.

In comparing the annual dropout rate for grades 7-12, the rate for white students decreased from 1.0 percent to 0.9 percent. The dropout rate for all students, Hispanic, and Economically Disadvantaged students remained constant at 1.6 percent, 2.3 percent, and 1.6 percent respectively. For African American students the rate increased slightly from 2.0 percent to 2.1 percent. The attendance rate for grades 1-12 showed an increase from 95.2 percent to 95.3 percent.

In summary, Table 1 shows longitudinal data for the three base indicators; the decreasing achievement gap among students in Texas; and the increase in performance by all student demographic groups. This is occurring even though the number of students tested is increasing, student demographics are changing, and the special education and bilingual students' test results are included.

Is Anyone Recognizing Texas for the Public School Accountability System?

Texas was one of only 12 states recognized by the National Education Goals Panel (NEGP) for making progress toward the eight national education goals and was recognized for outstanding progress toward the specific goal of all students leaving grades four, eight and 12 after demonstrating competency over challenging subject matter in foundation subjects and being prepared for responsible citizenship, further learning and productive employment (Association of Texas Professional Educators, 2000). Texas was one of only six states to show improvement in National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) math scores in grades four and eight between 1992-96, and along with

North Carolina, made the largest average gains in the nation on all NAEP exams during the same period. The full NAEP report is available at http://www.negp.gov.

In September 1999, the National Center for Education Statistics results of the 1998 NAEP eighth grade writing test revealed Texas eighth graders scoring at or above the proficient level was 7 percentage points higher than the national average; 5 percent higher than the average at the basic level; and 5 percent lower than the average at the below-basic level. This is an outstanding accomplishment considering that Texas' minority and economically disadvantaged student populations were 18 percent and 8 percent higher, respectively, than the national average (Association of Texas Professional Educators, 2000).

Accountability System for Educator Preparation

Effective September 1, 1998, Texas implemented the country's first accountability system for educator preparation programs, the Accountability System for Educator Preparation. When added to the already existing public school accountability system, this implementation in effect also gave Texas the only pre-kindergarten–16 accountability system in the country.

Authorized in 1995 with passage of Senate Bill 1, the intent of the accountability system "is to assure that educator preparation programs are held accountable for the readiness for certification of educators completing the programs. An educator preparation program is defined as an entity approved by the SBEC to recommend candidates for certification in one or more certification fields." (SBEC, 1999a; see Appendix A).

Entities meeting the above definition include universities, colleges and public school districts offering alternative certification programs. Additionally, Texas is divided into twenty educational service center regions, 13 of which offer alternative certification programs and are responsible for meeting accountability standards (SBEC, 1999b; see Appendix B).

When the educator preparation accountability system was implemented in September 1998, entities received one of three ratings: "Accredited," "Accredited-Under Review" or "Not Accredited."

Entities initiating educator preparation programs are rated "Accredited-Preliminary Status", a rating which may be maintained for three years, after which time the entity is to be held accountable to ASEP standards. While the entity is rated "Accredited-Preliminary Status", it may recommend candidates for certification.

ASEP requires performance levels to be met for seven demographic groups (all students, African American, Hispanic, white, other, male and female).

For educator preparation entities, the stakes are high. For example, an entity failing to meet performance standards thee consecutive years will be rated "Not Accredited". Likewise, the accountability system provides that the SBEC executive director "shall appoint an oversight team to make recommendations and provide assistance to an entity that is "Accredited-Under Review" (SBEC, 1999a). If by September 1 of the third year after being designated "Accredited-Under Review" the entity has not achieved the acceptable performance standards, SBEC's executive director may "request that the Board limit the entity to only preparing candidates for certification

in specified fields and collaborate with another entity to fully manage the program." (SBEC, 1999a).

The September 1998 ratings were based on certification examinees achieving a first time pass rate of 70 percent or higher or a cumulative pass rate of 80 percent or higher for each of the above demographic groups.

First time pass rate was defined as "The number of examinations [Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET), Texas Oral Proficiency Test (TOPT), or Texas Assessment of Sign Communication (TASC)] passed during an academic year on the first attempt divided by the number of first time attempts in that year." (SBEC, 1999a).

Critically, as we shall see later, the first time pass rate reflected a candidate's performance on the initial attempt on the test. If the candidate passed the test on a subsequent attempt during the same academic year as the initial attempt, that success was not reflected until the following year under the cumulative pass rate.

Cumulative pass rate was defined as "The number of examinations passed (by the previous year's first time takers) within the two year academic period divided by the number of previous year's first time tests taken. (This pass rate reflects performance on the last time a test was taken within the two academic years.)" (SBEC, 1999a)

If a candidate passed the test outside the two-year academic window referenced above, the candidate's score did not impact the entity for accountability purposes.

Entities rated "Accredited-Under Review" were allowed to request reconsideration of that rating by the SBEC if the rating were based upon having fewer than ten students in a demographic group (SBEC, 1999a).

The above provisions resulted in 16 of 86 educator preparation programs being rated "Accredited-Under Review" (SBEC, 1999c; see Appendix C).

Based upon feedback from the field, modifications to ASEP were instituted by SBEC. For example, the 1999 ratings were based on a candidate's performances during the first academic year the examination was administered, rather than on the candidate's first attempt.

Likewise, the field contended that small data samples should not be considered reliable indicators of an educator preparation program's effectiveness. Consequently, the number of students in a given demographic group necessary for that group's performance to effect the accountability rating was increased from 10 to 30 (SBEC, 1999a).

Still another change resulting from feedback from the field was occasioned by the public relations difficulty of an entity being initially identified as "Accredited-Under Review" but then being rated "Accredited" due to reconsideration of the rating being based on having a small number of candidates in a demographic group.

In the second year of its implementation, therefore, ASEP allowed entities to review their rating and request reconsideration prior to the rating being made public.

The release of the 1999 accountability ratings reflected performances of 87 educator preparation programs, ten of which were rated "Accredited-Under Review", with nine of these ten entities rated "Accredited-Under Review" for the second consecutive year (SBEC, 1999c). One entity did not receive a rating because no students had been enrolled in its program for the past two years.

Caution was encouraged in comparing the 1998 and 1999 ASEP ratings because, as noted above, the criteria for those ratings had changed.

The 1999 accountability ratings also reflected the first time SBEC issued commendations to educator preparation programs. For example, commendations were issued to 44 programs producing a diverse population of candidates in comparison to state or region diversity, and to programs producing teachers in high-need subjects (SBEC, 1999d; see Appendix D). Commendations for diversity were awarded to 28 entities, while 20 entities received commendations for high-need areas (SBEC, 1999d). Four entities received commendations in both categories (SBEC, 1999d).

As the changes in ASEP from 1998 to 1999 would suggest, the accountability system is a fluid mechanism. For example, assessment of classroom teachers' performance will be piloted in the 1999-2000 school year, with this process to be a component of the accountability system. This process will be formative for the teachers themselves but summative for their educator preparation program.

Likewise, the pass rates for meeting accreditation standards will increase, effective September 2002, from 70 percent to 75 percent for the first year pass rate and from 80 percent to 85 percent for the cumulative pass rate (SBEC, 1999a). This raising of standards suggests a number of implications for educator preparation entities' approaches in terms of identification of instructor/student needs and intervention strategies to address those needs.

Under present provisions, sanctions will continue to play a role as standards are raised. For example, effective September 1, 2002, "If the performances of all students within a certification field fails to meet requirements...for three consecutive academic years, the entity may no longer recommend persons for certification in that field."

(SBEC, 1999a). Being unable to certify candidates in a field(s) could negatively effect enrollment and, by extension, have substantial revenue consequences.

These twin elements of continuous improvement and sanctions have engendered considerable debate between the regulatory and practitioner elements in the Lone Star state, with some feeling they have prodded entities into undertaking improvement efforts that would otherwise not have been attempted. A conflicting viewpoint suggests that continually "raising the bar" holds educators to a standard not found in other professions such as the legal or medical fields and that sanctions are counter-productive in a time of significant teacher shortages.

Results for ExCET and TOPT

The ASEP has established a set of rules judging a diverse array of educator preparation entities with the purpose of improving the quality of educator preparation, assessing the knowledge and skills candidates must possess, mandating acceptable levels of performance, and establishing a fair and equitable process. This section will review the current Accreditation State totals (see Appendix E), centering only on first year and cumulative pass rates data for the state of Texas.

The information was obtained from the SBEC and includes September 1, 1996 to the August 31, 1999 administration of ExCET and TOPT data. In addition, information on program delivery, curriculum, and procedures for entering and exiting teacher preparation programs at individual institutions was not available. What's more, size of the educator preparation program at individual entities and numbers of educator candidates in each program were not accessed either.

This investigation posits that there exists a wide performance gap between majority and minority student performance on ExCET and TOPT, potentially jeopardizing the entities' accreditation status. The following analysis will reveal the extent to which African American and Hispanic demographic groups are the least served by educator preparation programs based on acceptable levels of performance set by State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) on ExCET and TOPT. This discussion will focus on the unacceptable pass rates by the African American and Hispanic demographic groups but the white demographic group will be included only to demonstrate the impact on educator preparation entities when African American and Hispanic demographic groups appear as the least served clusters.

For discussion purposes, the1998-1999 statewide results of the State Board for Educator Certification Accreditation State Totals (SBEC, 1999e; see Appendix E) will be used as an example of an individual educator preparation accreditation rating. In other words, the performance of all educator preparation entities from 1996-1998 is averaged and gives the State an accredited rating rather than an individual entity. This document will analyze the report as if it were for a particular institution.

Upon examining the first time pass rates for 1998-1999, the entity meets accreditation status. Even though the African American group does not meet the 80 percent passing standard in the cumulative pass rate, it does meet standards in the first time pass rates.

The data indicate the wide achievement gap between the African American and Hispanic demographic groups and the white demographic group. There is a 19.36 percent difference between the African American and the white student groups and a

12.65 percent difference between the Hispanic and white students. The data also reveal an increase in performance over time as indicated by the cumulative scores. While white students only improve 3.75 percent, African American students improve 6.36 percent and the Hispanic students show the most improvement with 8.06 percent. Upon examining the first time pass rates for 1997-1998, the entity meets accreditation status. Even though the African American demographic group has an unacceptable 69.84 first year percent pass rate this group meets the 80 percent passing standard in the cumulative pass rate.

The data indicate the wide achievement gap between the African American and Hispanic demographic groups and the white demographic group. There is a 23.05 percent difference between the African American and the white student groups and 11.82 percent difference between the Hispanic and white students. The data also reveal an increase in performance over time as indicated by the cumulative scores. While white students only improve 3 percent, African American students improve 11.22 percent and the Hispanic students improve with 8.15 percent. The African American demographic group reveals a 3.69 percent academic increase in the first time pass rates in the 1998-1999 reporting period when compared to the 1997-1998 reporting period, but a 1.23 percent academic decrease in the cumulative pass rates for the same reporting periods. The Hispanic demographic group reveals a .91 percent academic increase in the first time pass rates in the 1998-1999 reporting period when compared to the 1997-1998 reporting period, but a 1 percent academic decrease for the same reporting periods.

The pass rates for the 1998-1999 reporting period barely satisfies acceptable standards for the African American demographic group while the cumulative pass rate does not meet standards. The African American demographic group has the lowest pass

rates when compared to the Hispanic and white student groups, but the data suggest a slight improvement over time in the first time pass rates. The African American demographic group improved the 1997-1998 first year pass rate from 69.84 percent to 73.45 percent in 1998-1999. This slight improvement is still far below that of the Hispanic and white demographic groups. The Hispanic demographic is second lowest with an 81.07 percent 1997-1998 first year pass rate, and 80.16 percent 1998-1999 first year pass rate. The data implies serious consequences for those entities not meeting the acceptable pass rates at first time or cumulative standards.

The 1996-1998 statewide data implies that, individually, there are several educator preparation programs not meeting the needs of African American and Hispanic prospective candidates by providing them with knowledge and skills needed to successfully pass the ExCET on the first and successive attempts. The quality of instruction, the quality of the program, or both could certainly be questioned according to the data. The African American demographic group did better on subsequent attempts on the ExCET and TOPT in the 1996-1998 reporting period than in the 1997-1999 reporting period. Even though the group shows gains over time, the achievement gap is still alarming considering the standards will be raised in the year 2002. When the standards are set at 75 percent first year pass rate and 85 percent cumulative pass rate, the African American demographic group will not meet standards in the state of Texas. One can only assume that intervention initiatives are taking place at educator preparation entities. A candidate could easily take an exam for a total of ten times within the two year window to impact the cumulative pass rate, before finally passing, but at the student's out of pocket expense.

On the one hand, the standards were raised on seven of the ExCET exams (see Appendix F) for the 1997-1998 school year that could contribute to the increase in number of entities not meeting the accreditation standards. The accountability rules were also amended for the 1998-1999 academic school year which could attribute for some of the increase in the first time pass rates both for the African American and Hispanic demographic groups.

Recognition of Texas' Efforts

Nine states, including Texas, made the Thomas B. Fordham Foundation's honor roll, earning a B or better, according to the leading conservative think tank that focuses on education. Texas was one of only two states to receive an A based on the average in four categories: A for subject mastery – to what extent teachers know the subjects they teach; A for the multiple pathways – the various ways teachers become certified; B for autonomy – how much control local campuses have over personnel; and A for accountability – holding schools and their staffs responsible for student learning. According to the foundation's report, "Texas earns top honors for its state-of-the-art teacher quality system (Association of Texas Professional Educators, 2000).

CLOSING THOUGHTS

Educators need to consider educational strategies as well as variables other than gender and ethnicity in impacting achievement of students of color. No longer can educators rely on cultural and linguistic barriers to absolve them from meeting expectations of a diverse population. The design and implementation of specific teaching methods result from assessing students' needs and then setting expectations in accordance to perceived academic ability. Trueba and Bartolome (1997) warn that even

the most pedagogically advanced strategies are ineffective in the hands of educators who believe ethnic, racial, and linguistic minority students are at best culturally disadvantaged and in need of fixing, or, at worst, culturally or genetically inferior and consequently beyond help. Even though successful teaching practices are identified, it is wrong to assume such methods guarantee successful student learning.

If educational institutions unite their efforts on both process and product, collaboration within and outside of colleges, accountability and assessment can serve as a mechanism for instructional enhancement. As Sewall (1996) indicates, this represents a change for those teaching in higher education. A priority in this endeavor is to increase financial allocations available to teacher preparation entities. Gifford (1987) agrees that an underlying cause of the low passing rates among people of color on teacher competency tests is inequity in resources devoted to teacher training institutions, particularly historically black colleges. Institutions may have some of the brightest students but, unless the breadth of knowledge and training needed to compete on an equal basis is provided, the pool of qualified teachers of color will decrease. Conducting self-evaluations leading to higher quality programs and higher quality students is not enough if candidates do not pass the exams. All that is needed now is to affirm the belief that a quality system of education will be attained only when there is equality of outcome in basic skills across economic as well as racial lines (Gifford, 1987).

The results from a testing program can be used to improve the quality of the curriculum as well as the quality of the program. With new initiatives for preparing students, Downs and Silvestro (1988) also assert that there is an increasing need to evaluate different program strategies for providing adequate support to prospective

teachers, effectiveness of that support, cost effectiveness of various strategies, and implications for upgrading current programs.

The movement for accountability is a reminder that public programs and institutions are not only symbols of the aspirations of society, but also serve as instruments for the pursuit of public goals, provide the opportunity for the profession to renew its thinking about the meaning of a teaching certificate, and serve as a means for evaluating how well the objectives of a program are attained (Jennings, 1989). The time has come for entities to use the accreditation process as a focus on standards set to measure the success of their students, rather than on standards for faculty and resources. It also means that educators in public school systems as well as in institutions of higher education must make a greater commitment to a systemic evaluation of a candidate's knowledge and skills throughout the preparation program. Frazier (1995) adds that it means being willing to adjust programs when desired qualities are not being demonstrated by prospective teachers. If existing resources, teaching methods, practices, or curriculum are not aligned with objectives and standards mandated by the State, educational institutions cannot expect students to attain success on TAAS, ExCET and TOPT.

Educator preparation institutions can choose to take charge of their destiny and demonstrate productive reform in the quality of their teacher preparation programs and eventually benefit the public school system. Systemic changes with a focus on student achievement can be beneficial both for the candidates and the entity. The new millennium offers challenges unparalleled in America's history and educators must change with the times, perhaps even pioneer change (Frazier, 1996). Accountability and

assessment promote internal and external collaboration with a common interest beneficial for all students in Texas educational settings. Tests are being used for improvement of curricula, instructional methods, instructional materials, and professional development, and are designed to measure higher order thinking skills, levels of knowledge and skills, and standards set to measure quality (Berk, 1993).

The TAAS and ASEP have demonstrated the achievement gap existing between pupils of color and white students, in addition to consequences education institutions have experienced. Among factors that seem to differentially influence the educational outcomes of African Americans and Hispanics in entities of higher learning are language, culture, historical orientation to particular institutions, and degree of acceptance into, and satisfaction with, the university community (Castle, 1993).

Throughout the process of change there must be a shared vision of the purpose, direction, and plan for the implementation of reform initiatives that will result in the restructuring necessary to improve quality and effectiveness (Marshall,1997). Instructors in higher education institutions should begin to make programmatic changes, accept their moral obligation to all students, make a concerted effort not to expect minority students to fit into white structures, address learning styles, vary teaching methods, celebrate diversity, and develop the process of problem solving in a response to accountability. Ultimately, educator preparation entities in Texas have an opportunity to define their future, model successful accountability and assessment for higher education in the nation, and transform American education.

References

Association of Texas Professional Educators. (2000, January). Texas educators soar to new heights. Straight Talk, 14(5), 1 & 4.

Berk, Ronald A. (1993). National trends in student and teacher assessment: issues in performance assessment. In Performance Assessment in Teacher Certification Testing. (pp. 17-32). Amherst, MA: National Evaluation Systems, Inc.

Brooks, A. P. (1999, November 16). Texas teachers earn 'A' in national report. Austin American Statesman, pp. B1, B6).

Caldwell, Brian, & Spinks, Jim. (1988). The self-managing school. London: The Falmer Press.

Castle, Evangeline McConnell. (1993). Minority student attrition research: Higher education's challenge for human resource development. Educational Researcher, 22 (7), 24-30.

Darling-Hammond, Linda. (1994). Performance-based assessment and educational equity. Harvard Educational Review, 64 (1), 5-27.

Downs, Sharon L. & Silvestro, John, R. (1988). Increasing the benefits of teacher certification testing programs through the use of support systems. In Bias Issues In Teacher Certification Testing. (pp. 99-116). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

The Editors. (1997, January 22). Standards and assessments. Education Week, 16, pp. 32-35.

Education Service Center, Region XIII. '97 Peer assistant training institute training manual. 19 texas administrative code chapter 229. accountability system for educator preparation. Austin, TX. Education Service Center, Region XIII, July, 1997, Tab 2, 1-5.

Elliot, Emerson J. (1997). Applying a performance-based concept to accreditation. In Linking Standards And Assessments. (pp. 37-47). Amherst, MA: National Evaluation Systems, Inc.

Finn, Chester E. Jr. (1992). Why are our children learning so little? In Current Topics in Teacher Certification Testing. (pp. 33-47). Amherst, MA: National Evaluation Systems, Inc.

Frazier, Calvin M. (1995). Assessment and evaluation in teacher education renewal. In Perspectives in Teacher Certification Testing. (1-9). Amherst, MA: National Evaluation Systems, Inc.

Gifford, Bernard R. (1987). Excellence and equity in teacher competency testing: a policy perspective. In The Validity Issue: What Should Teacher Certification Tests Measure? (pp. 51-79). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Goodlad, J. I. (1990). Teachers for our Nation's Schools. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Holt, Maurice. (1996). The making of casablanca and the making of curriculum. Journal of Curriculum Studies, 28, (3), 241-251.

Jennings, Edward T Jr. (1989). Accountability, program quality, outcome assessment, and graduate education for public affairs and administration. Public Administration Review, 438-446.

Johns, Gary. (1996). Organizational Behavior: Understanding and Managing Life at Work, Fourth Edition. Harper Collins *College Publishers.*

Linn, Robert L. (1994). Performance assessment: policy promises and technical measurement standards. Educational Researcher, 23 (9), 4-13.

Locke, D. C. (1992). Increasing multicultural understanding. Newbury Park, Ca: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Marshall, Maureen M. (1997). Education reform...when the doors of America's classrooms close. In Linking Standards And Assessments.(pp. 119-123). Amherst, MA: National Evaluation Systems, Inc.

Mercer, W.A. (1983). Teacher education admission requirements: Alternatives for black prospective teachers and other minorities. Journal of Teacher Education, 35, 26-29.

National Assessment of Educational Progress. (1999). The national education goals: Build a nation of learners. [On-Line]. Available: http://www.negp.gov/page 7.htm.

Ravitch, Diane. (1996). Why do catholic schools succeed? Forbes, 158, (8), 81.

Rebell, Michael A. (1987). Disparate impact of teacher competency testing on minorities: don't blame the test takers-or the tests. In The Validity Issue: What Should Teacher Certification Tests Measure? (pp. 1-34). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Robinson, Sharon Porter. (1996). Building a strong foundation: The importance of knowledge and high standards in improving teacher education. In Teachers for the New Millennium: Aligning Teacher Development, National Goals, and High Standards for All Students. (pp. 183-188) Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Sewall, Angela M. (1996). From the importance of education in the 80's to accountability in the 90's. Education, 116 (3), 325-332.

Sewall, Angela M. (1997). Accountability and teacher education. Phi Kappa Phi, 77 (1), 38-41.

State Board for Educator Certification. (1999a). 1999 accountability system for educator preparation. [On-line]. Available: http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/geninfo/rules/ch229.pdf.

State Board for Educator Certification. (1999b). Accountability system for educator preparation 1999 results: Programs rated "accredited". [On-line]. Available: http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/edprep/edprep.htm.

State Board for Educator Certification. (1999c). Accountability system for educator preparation 1999 results: Summary of ratings for 1998 & 1999. [On-line]. Available: http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/edprep/1998_review.htm.

State Board for Educator Certification. (1999d). Accountability system for educator preparation 1999 results: Programs receiving commendations for preparation of candidates. [On-line]. Available: http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/edprep/commend.pdf.

State Board for Educator Preparation. (1999e). Accountability system for educator preparation 1999 results: State accreditation statistics. [On-line]. Available: http://www.sbec.state.tx.us/edprep/edprep.htm.

Texas Education Agency. Accountability manual: The 1994-95 accountability rating system for texas public schools and school districts. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency, April 1994, 45-48.

Texas Education Agency. 1999 accountability manual: The 1999 accountability rating system for texas public schools and school districts and blueprint for the 2000 – 2003 accountability systems. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency, April 1999, 2.

Texas Education Agency. (1999). 1998-99 state accountability report. [On-Line]. Available: http://www.tea.state.tx.us/perfreport/account/99/state.html.

Texas Education Agency. Resource guide on site-based decision making and district and campus planning. Austin, TX: Texas Education Agency, January 1992, II-1.

Thompson, James. (1994). Systemic education reform. Eugene, Oregon. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. Ed 370 178)

Trueba, Enrique T & Bartolome, Lilia I. (1997). The education of latino students: is school reform enough? (Report No. 123). Urban Education, New York, NY. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 410 367)

Wittmer, Joe. (1992). Valuing diversity in the schools: the counselor's role. Ann Arbor, Mich. (ERIC Document Ed 347 475).

Table 1

STATE PERFORMANCE ON ACCOUNTABILITY INDICATORS: 1993 TO 1998

Base Indicator	1993 †	1994 ‡	1995 ‡	1996 ‡	1997 ‡	1998 ‡	Chg: 94-98
TAAS Results, *summed across grades [accountability subset]*							
Low-performing Standard	20% [ATT]	25%	25%	30%	35%	40%	+15%
READING							
All Students	69.8%	76.5%	78.4%	80.4%	84.0%	87.0% -	86.5 +10.5%
African American	51.3%	60.2%	63.0%	66.8%	73.2%	78.2% x	78.2 +18.0%
Hispanic	54.1%	64.9%	67.9%	70.3%	75.3%	79.5% x	79.5 +14.6%
White	83.5%	87.2%	88.4%	90.0%	92.4%	94.2% -	93.7 +7.0%
Economically Disadvantaged	51.3%	62.9%	66.1%	68.4%	73.7%	78.4% -	78.0 +15.5%
MATHEMATICS							
All Students	53.6%	60.5%	65.9%	74.2%	80.1%	84.2% +	85.7 +23.7%
African American	30.1%	38.1%	43.8%	55.0%	64.1%	70.5% +	70.8 +32.4%
Hispanic	37.2%	47.1%	52.3%	63.9%	71.8%	77.7% +	80.7 +30.6%
White	68.3%	73.3%	79.2%	85.0%	89.5%	91.9% +	92.5 +18.6%
Economically Disadvantaged	35.2%	45.0%	51.4%	62.3%	70.5%	76.1% +	78.7 +31.1%
WRITING							
All Students	79.8%	79.0%	82.0%	82.9%	85.3%	87.4% +	88.2 +8.4%
African American	68.1%	65.8%	70.5%	72.8%	76.1%	80.4% +	81.9 +14.6%
Hispanic	69.0%	69.6%	73.4%	74.2%	77.6%	80.9% +	83.1 +11.3%
White	89.2%	87.6%	89.7%	90.5%	92.5%	93.4% -	93.1 +5.8%
Economically Disadvantaged	67.6%	67.7%	71.5%	72.9%	76.0%	79.7% +	81.4 +12.0%
Annual Dropout Rate, Gr. 7-12							
All Students	3.8%	2.8%	2.6%	1.8%	1.8%	1.6% x	1.6 -1.2%
African American	4.8%	3.6%	3.2%	2.3%	2.3%	2.0% +	2.0 -1.6%
Hispanic	5.5%	4.2%	3.9%	2.7%	2.5%	2.3% x	2.3 -1.9%
White	2.5%	1.7%	1.5%	1.2%	1.1%	1.0% -	.9 -0.7%
Economically Disadvantaged	3.5%	2.9%	2.7%	1.9%	1.7%	1.6% x	1.6 -1.3%
Attendance Rate, Grades 1-12	95.1%	94.9%	95.1%	95.1%	95.1%	95.2% +	95.3 +0.3%

† 1993 performance is not comparable to later years because: 1) all subjects of TAAS were administered to grades 4, 8, and 10; and 2) the dropout rate methodology differed from that used in 1994 and beyond.

‡ TAAS reading and mathematics were administered to grades 3-8, and 10; TAAS writing was administered to grades 4, 8, and 10.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PROPOSED BY THE STATE BOARD FOR EDUCATOR CERTIFICATION ON OCTOBER 3, 1997

19 Texas Administrative Code Chapter 229, Accountability System for Educator Preparation

Statutory Authority: These sections are proposed under the Texas Education Code (TEC) §21.045, which requires the State Board for Educator Certification to propose rules establishing standards to govern the continuing accountability of all educator preparation programs.

§229.1. General Provisions and Purpose of Accountability System

(a) The State Board for Educator Certification (SBEC) is responsible for insuring an adequate supply of qualified and competent professional educators for the state public school system. This chapter, relating to the professional educator preparation accountability system, governs accreditation of all entities that prepare educators for Texas public schools.

(b) The purpose of the accountability system for educator preparation is to assure that entities are held accountable for the readiness for certification of educators completing the programs. An educator preparation program is defined as an entity approved by the State Board for Educator Certification to recommend candidates for certification in one or more certification fields. At a minimum, accreditation is based on the performance of candidates for certification on examinations prescribed under Section 21.048(a) and beginning educators' performance on the appraisal system adopted by the Board. The Board may adopt additional measures. Each entity is required to file an annual report of performance indicators. An entity will receive commendations for success in areas identified by the Board.

§229.2. Definitions

The following words and terms when used in this chapter shall have the following meanings, unless the context clearly indicates otherwise:

Academic year—September 1 through August 31

Acceptable—A minimum criterion set by the Board

Beginning educator—A person employed within the first two years after completing educator preparation program requirements in an accredited preparation program, who passed the appropriate assessment(s) for the field of certification pursued and was certified (received Texas certificate), and who was assigned in his/her area of certification.

Certification field—Professional development (elementary and secondary) and delivery system fields, academic or vocational content fields, special education fields, or professional fields in which an entity is approved to offer certification.

Cohort group—A group of persons admitted and beginning an educator preparation program in an academic year.

Cumulative pass rate—The number of examinations passed (by the previous year's first time takers) within the two year academic period divided by the number of previous year's first time tests taken. (This pass rate reflects performance on the last time a test was taken within the two academic years.)

Educator preparation program—An entity approved by the Board to recommend candidates in one or more certification fields. For the purposes of this section, "program" and "entity" are used interchangeably.

First time pass rate—The number of examinations [Examination for the Certification of Educators in Texas (ExCET), Texas Oral Proficiency Test (TOPT), or Texas Assessment of Sign Communication (TASC)] passed during an academic year on the first attempt divided by the number of first time attempts in that year. (The pass rate reflects performance only on the student's initial attempt on the test.)

Performance indicators—Data elements about a cohort of persons admitted to an educator preparation program in an academic year, including preparation for all certification fields.

§229.3. The Accreditation Process

(a) Annually, beginning September 1, 1998, an entity must meet the accreditation standards at acceptable levels of performance set by the Board.

(b) An entity is rated "Accredited," "Accredited—Under Review," or "Not Accredited." Upon initial review of an entity desiring to prepare educators for certification, an entity will be rated "Accredited—Preliminary Status," which an entity may maintain for three years, after which time the entity will be held to the standards in paragraphs (e) and (f) of this section. Persons may be recommended for certification while an entity is "Accredited—Preliminary Status."

(c) An entity is accountable for the performance of all candidates for certification. Pass rates on examinations and performance within the first two years in the profession determine the accreditation rating.

(d) Accreditation relating to test performance will be based upon first time and cumulative pass rates. In no event shall the first time or cumulative pass rates provided for in this section be less than 66 2/3 percent.

(e) Accreditation of Entity

(1) For an entity to be "Accredited" to prepare educators, performance must be as follows for each demographic group (all students, African American, Hispanic, white, other, male, female):

(A) acceptable pass rates for all tests taken for the first time during the academic year prior to the issuance of the accreditation rating, or

(B) acceptable cumulative pass rates for all tests taken for the two years prior to the issuance of the accreditation rating; and

(C) effective September 1, 2002, persons in an educator role who complete certification requirements from the entity between September 1, 1999 and August 31, 2000 and every academic year thereafter must meet performance requirements. The Board will determine the method of assessing performance. The basis for the accreditation rating will be the performance of persons employed in a Texas public school and assigned in their area of certification.

(D) Based upon performance required by (A) and (B) above, an entity rated "Accredited—Under Review" may request reconsideration of that status by the executive director if the status is based upon less than 10 students in a demographic group. The executive director may remove the entity from "Accredited—Under Review" status.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

2) Effective September 1, 2002, for an entity to be accredited, an acceptable proportion of the certification fields offered by an entity must indicate performance of all students within the field at either of the following levels:

(A) acceptable pass rates for all tests taken for the first time during the academic year prior to the issuance of the accreditation rating, or

(B) acceptable cumulative pass rates for all tests taken for the two years prior to the issuance of the accreditation rating.

(3) An entity not meeting the performance standards for "Accredited" receives the rating of "Accredited—Under Review." An entity receiving the rating "Accredited—Under Review" for three consecutive years becomes "Not Accredited."

(4) When persons are enrolled in an entity which is "Accredited—Under Review" but then becomes "Unaccredited," these persons may complete their program and be recommended for certification.

(5) An entity must wait three consecutive years before reapplying to the Board for "Accredited—Preliminary Status."

(6) If an entity disagrees with its accreditation status, the entity may appeal the determination of the accreditation status to the executive director of the Board.

(7) An entity must notify persons enrolled in an educator preparation program of any change of accreditation status.

(f) Approval of Certification Field

(1) For a certification field to be approved, performance of all students within the certification field must be at or above specified levels for three consecutive academic years:

(A) acceptable first time pass rates in each academic year; or

(B) acceptable cumulative pass rates in each academic year.

(2) If a certification field has fewer than five first-time test takers during an academic year, performance will be grouped with performance of examinees in the following year.

(3) If the performance of all students within a certification field fails to meet either of the above levels for three consecutive academic years, the entity may no longer recommend persons for certification in that field. The entity may request reconsideration if a field is no longer approved. The executive director may reinstate the field. The entity must wait two years before reapplying to offer certification in that field, but may not reapply to offer that field or any other field if the entity is "Accredited—Under Review."

(g) Commendations for Success

An entity may receive commendations for success in identified areas if the entity is "Accredited." The Board will establish expectations for the following areas in which an entity may be commended:

(1) Preparation of persons for high need teaching fields. Based upon the Board's determination of fields of statewide and regional need, the entity successfully prepares a significant proportion, as established by the Board, of its candidates for certification in the fields of highest need. Areas of need will be established for periods of five years with the first period beginning September 1, 1997 through September 1, 2002.

(2) Diversity of candidates recommended for certification by an entity. An entity recommends a percent of ethnic minority candidates within a specified range of the distribution of the respective groups in the student population. The diversity of the public school student population of either the state or the education service center region in which the entity is located is the basis for the comparison.

(3) Evidence of financial support for a teacher preparation program as defined by the Board.

(4) Field-based educator preparation. A significant proportion, as defined by the Board, of the faculty and candidates participating in educator preparation spend a specified amount of their time working collaboratively with practicing professionals in Texas public school classrooms.

(h) Oversight of Entity "Accredited—Under Review"

(1) The executive director of the Board shall appoint an oversight team to make recommendations and provide assistance to an entity that is "Accredited—Under Review."

(A) The executive director shall notify in writing an institution of higher education president and dean or department chair of education, an education service center executive director, and/or a superintendent of a school district of the appointment of an oversight team.

(B) Members of the oversight team, including the chair, are appointed by the executive director. The entity under review shall be responsible for the reasonable and necessary expenses of the oversight team and, when appropriate, for the expenses of any person assigned to administer and manage the educator preparation program.

(C) With the cooperation of the entity, the oversight team shall collect information about the program and develop strategies for improvement. All recommendations and reports of the progress of the program toward improvement must be provided in writing to the entity and to the executive director. The executive director shall verify if the entity is attempting to implement the recommendations of the oversight team.

(D) No later than 30 days after receiving the recommendations of an oversight team, the entity shall submit to the executive director an action plan for addressing the recommendations.

(E) No later than May 31 of each year that an entity is "Accredited—Under Review," the entity must submit to the executive director a progress report related to the recommendations of the oversight team.

(F) The executive director shall notify Texas public school districts of the change in accreditation status of a certification program.

(2) If, after one year, the executive director determines that an entity that is "Accredited—Under Review" has not fulfilled the recommendations of the oversight team, the executive director shall appoint a person to administer and manage the operations of the program.

(A) The executive director shall, based upon the type and severity of the problems of the preparation program, inform the president of the university, executive director of the education service center, or superintendent of schools of the powers and duties of the person assigned to administer and manage the educator certification program.

(B) The powers and duties of the person appointed to administer and manage the program may include overseeing daily programmatic decisions, supervision of staff, budget control or development, and curriculum-related decisions. The person may disapprove actions proposed by the program administrator or staff.

(3) An entity must achieve acceptable performance, as set by the Board, on standards required for accreditation no later than September 1 of the third year after being placed on "Accredited—Under Review" status. Considering input of the oversight team, the executive director may at any time, prior to revocation of an entity's accreditation, request that the Board limit the entity to only preparing candidates for certification in specified fields and collaborate with another entity to fully manage the program.

§229.4. Reporting Requirements

(a) Each entity must file an annual performance report of its educator preparation program with the Board no later than June 1 following each academic year. The performance report complies with statutory requirements and provides data for a comprehensive analysis of the preparation program.

(b) The annual performance report includes the level of attainment on the six performance indicators required by statute. These indicators do not affect accreditation status unless adopted by the Board as performance measures.

(c) Performance indicators are reported by annual cohort groups and are disaggregated by gender and ethnicity (African American, Hispanic, white, and other). Performance indicators include:

(1) the number of persons who apply: the number of persons who declare an intent, pursuant to each entity's policies and procedures, to the educator preparation program their desire to be an educator;

(2) the number of persons admitted: the number of persons who meet all minimum admission criteria of the preparation program and those criteria established by the Board during an academic year;

(3) the number of persons retained: the number of persons who were admitted to and enrolled in the preparation program any time during an academic year;

(4) the number of persons completing the program: the number of persons who have completed all program requirements and passed appropriate examinations;

(5) the number of persons employed in the profession after completing the program: the number of persons employed in a public school in Texas within two years of receiving the certificate, who may or may not be assigned in the area in which they were certified; and

(6) the number of persons retained in the profession: the number of persons employed in the profession two years after initial employment and five years after initial employment. A person may be assigned in any role requiring a certificate in a Texas public school (both teaching and non-teaching roles).

§229.5. Implementation of Accountability System for Educator Preparation

This chapter is adopted by the State Board of Education under the provisions of Texas Education Code, §21.045. The State Board for Educator Certification shall administer the Accountability System for Educator Preparation and may propose amendments to this chapter. The State Board of Education may adopt amendments to this chapter until December 31, 1998. Full authority for this chapter shall be transferred to the State Board for Educator Certification on January 1, 1999.

State Board for Educator Certification

1001 Trinity Austin, Texas 78701-2603 512/469-3000
Fax: 512/469-3002 Web site: http://www.sbec.state.tx.us

1999 Accountability System for Educator Preparation

Programs Rated "Accredited"

Abilene Christian University
Angelo State University (San Angelo)
Austin College (Sherman)
Baylor University (Waco)
Concordia University at Austin
Dallas Baptist University
Dallas Independent School District
East Texas Baptist University (Marshall)
Region 2 Education Service Center (Corpus Christi)
Region 3 Education Service Center (Victoria)
Region 4 Education Service Center (Houston)
Region 6 Education Service Center (Huntsville)
Region 9 Education Service Center (Wichita Falls)
Region 10 Education Service Center (Richardson)
Region 11 Education Service Center (Fort Worth)
Region 12 Education Service Center (Waco)
Region 13 Education Service Center (Austin)
Region 14 Education Service Center (Abilene)
Region 18 Education Service Center (Midland)
Region 19 Education Service Center (El Paso)
Region 20 Education Service Center (San Antonio)
Hardin-Simmons University (Abilene)
Houston Baptist University
Houston Independent School District
Howard Payne University (Brownwood)*
Jarvis Christian College (Hawkins)*
Lamar University (Beaumont)*
LeTourneau University (Longview)
Lubbock Christian University
McMurry University (Abilene)
Midwestern State University (Wichita Falls)
Our Lady of the Lake University (San Antonio)
Pasadena Independent School District
Rice University (Houston)
Sam Houston State University (Huntsville)
Schreiner College (Kerrville)
Southern Methodist University (Dallas)
Southwest Texas State University (San Marcos)
Southwestern Adventist University (Keene)*
Southwestern Assemblies of God College (Waxahachie)
Southwestern University (Georgetown)
St. Edward's University (Austin)
St. Mary's University (San Antonio)
Tarleton State University (Stephenville)
Texas A&M – International University (Laredo)
Texas A&M University – College Station
Texas A&M University – Corpus Christi
Texas A&M University – Kingsville
Texas A&M University – Texarkana
Texas Christian University (Fort Worth)
Texas Lutheran College (Seguin)
Texas Southern University (Houston)*
Texas Tech University (Lubbock)
Texas Wesleyan University (Fort Worth)
Trinity University (San Antonio)
University of Central Texas (Killeen)**
University of Dallas (Irving)
University of Houston
University of Houston – Clear Lake
University of Houston – Downtown
University of Houston – Victoria
University of Mary Hardin-Baylor (Belton)
University of North Texas (Denton)*
University of St. Thomas (Houston)
University of Texas – Brownsville
University of Texas – Arlington
University of Texas – Austin
University of Texas – Dallas (Richardson)
University of Texas – El Paso
University of Texas – Pan American (Edinburg)
University of Texas – Permian Basin (Odessa)
University of Texas – San Antonio
University of Texas – Tyler
University of the Incarnate Word (San Antonio)*
Wayland Baptist University (Plainview)
West Texas A&M University (Canyon)

---

* 1998 ASEP rating was "Accredited – Under Review."
** As of September 1, 1999, the University of Central Texas has merged with Tarleton State University.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

State Board for Educator Certification

1001 Trinity Austin, Texas 78701-2603 512/469-3000
Fax: 512/469-3002 Web site: http://www.sbec.state.tx.us

1999 Accountability System for Educator Preparation

Please note that the criteria used to determine "Accredited" and "Accredited – Under Review" status in 1998-99 are not the same as the criteria used to determine accreditation status in 1997-98. Please refer to the "ASEP Policies and Information" document for a description of the changes in criteria.

	1998-99	1997-98
Education Preparation Programs	87	86
Accredited Programs	76	70
Accredited "Under Review" Programs	10	16
Accredited "Under Review" 1st Year	1	16
Accredited "Under Review" 2nd Year	9	N/A
Programs Not Rated	1	N/A
Programs Receiving Commendations	44	N/A
Diversity Commendations	28	N/A
Diversity Growth	15	N/A
Diversity Achievement	13	N/A
High-Need Area Commendations	20	N/A

State Board for Educator Certification

1001 Trinity Austin, Texas 78701-2603 512/469-3000
Fax: 512/469-3002 Web site: http://www.sbec.state.tx.us

1999 Accountability System for Educator Preparation

Programs Receiving Commendations for Preparation of Candidates

Concordia University at Austin		High-Need Area
Dallas Independent School District	Diversity	
East Texas Baptist University	Diversity	
Region 2 Education Service Center		High-Need Area
Region 3 Education Service Center		High-Need Area
Region 4 Education Service Center	Diversity	High-Need Area
Region 6 Education Service Center		High-Need Area
Region 9 Education Service Center		High-Need Area
Region 10 Education Service Center		High-Need Area
Region 11 Education Service Center		High-Need Area
Region 14 Education Service Center		High-Need Area
Region 18 Education Service Center	Diversity	High-Need Area
Region 19 Education Service Center	Diversity	High-Need Area
Region 20 Education Service Center		High-Need Area
Houston Baptist University	Diversity	
Houston Independent School District	Diversity	
Howard Payne University		High-Need Area
Lamar University	Diversity	
McMurry University		High-Need Area
Our Lady of the Lake University	Diversity	
Pasadena Independent School District		High-Need Area
Rice University		High-Need Area
Schreiner College		High-Need Area
Southern Methodist University	Diversity	
Southwest Texas State University	Diversity	
Southwestern Adventist University	Diversity	
St. Edward's University	Diversity	High-Need Area
Tarleton State University		High-Need Area
Texas A&M International University	Diversity	
Texas A&M University - Corpus Christi		High-Need Area
Texas A&M University - Kingsville	Diversity	
Texas Southern University	Diversity	
Texas Tech University	Diversity	
Texas Wesleyan University	Diversity	
University of Houston	Diversity	
University of Houston - Clear Lake	Diversity	
University of Houston - Downtown	Diversity	
University of St. Thomas	Diversity	
University of Texas - Brownsville	Diversity	
University of Texas - El Paso	Diversity	
University of Texas - Pan American	Diversity	
University of Texas - Permian Basin	Diversity	
Wayland Baptist University	Diversity	
West Texas A&M University	Diversity	

State Board for Educator Certification

Accountability System for Educator Preparation - Accreditation Status Report

Issued in accordance with TEC § 21.045 and 19 TAC Chapter 229.

State Totals for 1998-1999 School Year

First Year Pass Rates: 09/01/1998 - 08/31/1999

	All Students	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic	Other	White
1st Year Test Takers	21600	16378	5081	1749	5312	294	14105
1st Year Tests Taken	40777	31391	9097	2776	9812	562	27345
1st Year Tests Passed	35976	28047	7684	2039	7865	453	25380
1st Year Pass Rate %	88.23	89.35	84.47	73.45	80.16	80.60	92.81

First Year Pass Rates: 09/01/1997 - 08/31/1998

1st Year Test Takers	19629	14765	4815	1536	4831	291	12921
1st Year Tests Taken	37773	28771	8912	2553	8923	568	25640
1st Year Tests Passed	33367	25733	7561	1783	7234	462	23816
1st Year Pass Rate %	88.34	89.44	84.84	69.84	81.07	81.34	92.89

Combined First Year Pass Rates: 09/01/1997 - 08/31/1999

1st Year Test Takers	29945	9518	3149	9329	565	26415
1st Year Tests Taken	60162	18009	5329	18735	1130	52985
1st Year Tests Passed	53780	15245	3822	15099	915	49196
1st Year Pass Rate %	89.39	84.65	71.72	80.59	80.97	92.85

Cumulative Pass Rates: 09/01/1997 - 08/31/1999

	All Students	Female	Male	African American	Hispanic	Other	White
Cumulative Test Takers	19629	14765	4815	1536	4831	291	12921
Cumulative Tests Taken	37773	28771	8912	2553	8923	568	25640
Cumulative Tests Passed	35004	26922	8006	2038	7872	488	24528
Cumulative Pass Rate %	92.67	93.57	89.83	79.83	88.22	85.92	95.66

Cumulative Pass Rates: 09/01/1996 - 08/31/1998

Cumulative Test Takers	21677	16225	5393	1566	5193	307	14557
Cumulative Tests Taken	41870	31634	10119	2540	9787	583	28860
Cumulative Tests Passed	39089	29755	9230	2059	8724	538	27673
Cumulative Pass Rate %	93.36	94.06	91.21	81.06	89.14	92.28	95.89

Combined Cumulative Pass Rates: 09/01/1996 - 08/31/1999

Cumulative Test Takers	29585	9728	2929	9138	568	26686
Cumulative Tests Taken	60405	19031	5093	18710	1151	54500
Cumulative Tests Passed	56677	17236	4097	16596	1026	52201
Cumulative Pass Rate %	93.83	90.57	80.44	88.70	89.14	95.78

EXAMINATION FOR THE CERTIFICATION OF EDUCATORS IN TEXAS (EXCET)

PASSING STANDARDS INFORMATION

		CURRENT PASSING STANDARDS			PASSING STANDARDS EFFECTIVE NOVEMBER 1997		PASSING STANDARDS EFFECTIVE OCTOBER 1998	
			Passing Standard		*Passing Standard*		*Passing Standard*	
Field No.	**ExCET Test (Field Name)**	**Number of Items**	**Number of Items**	**Percent Correct**	**Number of Items**	**Percent Correct**	**Number of Items**	**Percent Correct**
66	Bilingual Elementary Comprehensive	160	108	67.5	112	70.0		
67	Bilingual Endorsement	80	54	67.5	56	70.0		
61	Educational Diagnostician	80	52	65.0	62	77.5		
04	Elementary Comprehensive	160	109	68.1			112	70.0
28	History (Secondary)	80	50	62.5			53	66.3
35	Learning Resources	80	52	65.0	56	70.0		
17	Mathematics (Secondary)	80	54	67.5			56	70.0
68	Principal (Mid-Management)	100	64	64.0	70	70.0		
02	Professional Development (Elementary)	80	51	63.8			56	70.0
03	Professional Development (Secondary)	80	51	63.8			56	70.0
45	Reading (Secondary)	80	54	67.5			60	75.0
60	School Counselor	80	51	63.8	55	68.8		
65	Middle School Science	80	51	63.8	60	75.0		

SCALED SCORE EQUIVALENTS FOR STANDARDS

Effective October 1998

Use these scaled score values only for test scores obtained in 1997-1998; do not use in 1998-1999.

TEST	SCALED SCORE
Elementary Comprehensive	72
History (Secondary)	73
Mathematics (Secondary)	72
Professional Development (Elementary)	75
Professional Development (Secondary)	75
Reading (Secondary)	77

BEST COPY AVAILABLE